

Termination of the Sequence of SDS Sets and Machine Decision for Positive Semi-definite Forms

Yong Yao

*Chengdu Institute of Computer Applications ,
Chinese Academy of Sciences , Chengdu 610041, P. R. China
Email: yaoyong@casit.ac.cn; yaoyong@yahoo.cn*

Abstract

Employing the concept of termination of sequence of SDS sets to describe the positive semi-definite property of a form, we establish a necessary and sufficient condition for deciding whether a given form on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$ is positive semi-definite or not, and show that, for a form which is (strictly) positive definite on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$, the corresponding sequence of SDS sets is positively terminating.

The above results are exactly constructed as follows: We define the column stochastic mean matrix first, and then prove that if we choose countable infinite matrices from finite $n \times n$ column stochastic mean ones at random (repeats allowed), then the product of these infinite matrices will converge to a column stochastic mean matrix with rank 1. Finally, we show the proof for relations between termination of the sequence of SDS sets and positive semi-definite property of a form.

The Maple program TSDS3, based upon these results, not only automatically prove the polynomial inequalities, but also output counter examples for those false. This method is verified to be very efficient and better than Pölya method.

Key words: Successive Difference Substitution; Sequence of SDS sets; Termination; Positive Semi-definite; Machine decision; Column stochastic mean matrix

1. Introduction

A traditional method which is now called *difference substitution* (DS) can be frequently found and applied to the proof of inequalities with symmetric form. However, this method does not involve asymmetric forms; it is also invalid for the problems failed with the first

* This work is partially supported by NKBRPC-2004CB318003, KIPCAS-KJXC2-YW-S02 and NSFC-90718041

substitution. To remedy that, Yang defined a general concept, difference substitution (Yang , 2005, 2006) , for both asymmetric and symmetric forms, and also introduced the method called *successive difference substitution* (SDS) which is the key to the studies later. According to these, Yang designed a heuristic Maple program SDS, which has been applied to prove a great many polynomial inequalities with more variables and higher degrees, some of which are still considered very hard with other computer algebra methods.

At the 2nd Summer School on Symbolic Computation (Beijing, China, July 15-22, 2006), Yang put forward an open problem (Yang , July 15-22, 2006) on the termination of successive difference substitution. That is, which kind of polynomials can be solved by SDS and which kind can not (here “*can be solved*” means that SDS can prove the polynomial inequality $f \geq 0$)? This problem, regarded as extremely difficult, has been spread widely.

Furthermore, how to apply the method to deciding whether an inequality is false? Like traditional method, Yang’s did not take it into account, which is completed in this paper. Thus, both in theory and application scope, the method of difference substitution is much stronger now than before.

The traditional method of difference substitution chooses the upper triangular matrix A_n as the basic substitution matrix. However, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, A_n^m does not converge. Here we can choose the matrix K ($q_i > 0$) as the basic substitution matrix. It is a pity that K^m does not converge at all times when $m \rightarrow \infty$. These make the discussion of termination of the sequence of SDS sets much more difficult. So ,finally we select T_n as the basic substitution matrix in order to overcome the termination problem more easily.

A_n , K and T_n are respectively denoted by,

$$A_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}; \quad K = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 & q_2 & \cdots & q_n \\ 0 & q_2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & q_n \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & q_n \end{bmatrix}; \quad T_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{n} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

It is easily to prove that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} T_n^m$ exists. And T_n has a better property: Let PT_n be the set consisting of matrices transformed by swapping any two rows of T_n , which comprises $n!$ elements. Choose countable infinite matrices from PT_n at random (repeats allowed), then the product of these infinite matrices will converge to a column stochastic matrix with rank 1.

Main Lemma. Let Ω be a set consisting of finite $n \times n$ column stochastic mean matrices (Def 2.1). Choose countable infinite matrices from Ω at random (repeats allowed), then the product of these infinite matrices will converge to a column stochastic mean matrix with rank 1.

Definition 1.1. The form (namely, homogeneous polynomials) $f(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n]$ is called positive semi-definite on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$, if

$$(\forall (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathcal{R}_+^n) f(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n) \geq 0,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_+^n = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) | x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, \dots, x_n \geq 0\}$. And the set of all positive semi-definite forms is denoted by PSD. If $f > 0$ for all $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, then f is called a positive definite form on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$ (briefly, a PD).

The main results in this paper as follows:

Theorem. 1° The form $f \in \text{PSD}$ iff the sequence of SDS sets (Def 3.4) of f is positively terminating (Def 3.6) or not terminating.

2° The form $f \notin \text{PSD}$ iff the sequence of SDS sets of f is negatively terminating (Def 3.7).

3° If the form $f \in \text{PD}$, then its sequence of SDS sets is positively terminating.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the basic properties of column stochastic mean matrix and the proof to the main Lemma. Section 3 introduces some preliminary notions of difference substitution. The proof of main results and the establishment of algorithm is presented in section 4 and the comparison with Pòlya theorem in section 5.

2. The Column Stochastic Mean Matrix and the Proof for Main Lemma

2.1. The column stochastic mean matrix

A column stochastic matrix is a square matrix whose columns consist of nonnegative real numbers whose sum is 1 (Horn, R. A., Johnson, C. R., 1999). The column stochastic matrix has a very important property, that is, let $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, and $A = [a_{(i,j)}]$ is a column stochastic matrix, then there is $eA = e$.

Lemma 2.1 Let $\alpha = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{R}_+^n$, where $x_1 + \dots + x_n = 1$. And $\beta = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \mathcal{R}_+^n$, where the maximal element of β is denoted with $\max(\beta)$, and the minimal element with $\min(\beta)$. Then there are

1° $\min(\beta) \leq x_1 b_1 + x_2 b_2 + \dots + x_n b_n \leq \max(\beta)$.

2° Let the subscripts that $\min(\beta)$ appears on β are $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k$ ($1 \leq k \leq n$) (that is $b_{s_1} = b_{s_2} = \dots = b_{s_k} = \min(\beta)$), then $\min(\beta) = x_1 b_1 + x_2 b_2 + \dots + x_n b_n$ iff $x_{s_1} + x_{s_2} + \dots + x_{s_k} = 1$.

3° Let the subscripts that $\max(\beta)$ appears on β are $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t$ ($1 \leq t \leq n$), then $\max(\beta) = x_1 b_1 + x_2 b_2 + \dots + x_n b_n$ iff $x_{r_1} + x_{r_2} + \dots + x_{r_t} = 1$.

4° $\min(\beta) = \max(\beta)$ iff all the elements of β are equal.

The proof for Lemma 2.1 is obviously and is omitted. Next, there be the definition of column stochastic mean matrix.

Definition 2.1 Let Q be a $n \times n$ column stochastic matrix, and $\beta = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ be any set of nonnegative real numbers that are not totally equal. If

$$[\min(\beta Q), \max(\beta Q)] \subset [\min(\beta), \max(\beta)].$$

holds, then Q is a column stochastic mean matrix.

The condition of Definition 2.1 is very strict. Consider the following two matrices,

$$Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

in which Q_1 is not a column stochastic mean matrix. Because for a vector $\beta = (0, 0, 1)$, we have $[\min(\beta), \max(\beta)] = [0, 1]$ and $[\min(\beta Q_1), \max(\beta Q_1)] = [0, 1]$, which doesn't satisfy the condition of Definition 2.1. And we can prove that Q_2 satisfies the condition of Definition 2.1. Thus there is a natural question, that is, what condition makes a column stochastic matrix become a column stochastic mean matrix?

Lemma 2.2. The $n \times n$ column stochastic matrix $A = [a_{(i,j)}]$ is a column stochastic mean matrix iff for two arbitrary columns of A

$$\text{Col}(A, j_1) = (a_{(1,j_1)}, a_{(2,j_1)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)})^T, \quad \text{Col}(A, j_2) = (a_{(1,j_2)}, a_{(2,j_2)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_2)})^T$$

there be

$$(a_{(1,j_1)}a_{(1,j_2)}, a_{(2,j_1)}a_{(2,j_2)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)}a_{(n,j_2)}) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Proof. $\Rightarrow$:(proof by contradiction) Suppose there are two columns $\text{Col}(A, j_1), \text{Col}(A, j_2)$ of the column stochastic mean matrix $A = [a_{(i,j)}]$ such that

$$(a_{(1,j_1)}a_{(1,j_2)}, a_{(2,j_1)}a_{(2,j_2)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)}a_{(n,j_2)}) = (0, 0, \dots, 0).$$

we might as well suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{(1,j_1)} \neq 0, \dots, a_{(t,j_1)} \neq 0, \quad a_{(t+1,j_1)} = 0, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)} = 0, \\ a_{(1,j_2)} = 0, \dots, a_{(k,j_2)} = 0, \quad a_{(k+1,j_2)} \neq 0, \dots, a_{(n,j_2)} \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq t \leq k < n$.

Let $\beta(t) = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_t, 0, \dots, 0)$, then $[\min(\beta(t)), \max(\beta(t))] = [0, 1]$. By Lemma 2.1,

there be $[\min(\beta(t)A), \max(\beta(t)A)] = [0, 1]$, a contradiction.

$\Leftarrow$: Let $A = [a_{(i,j)}]$ be a $n \times n$ column stochastic matrix, and pick any two columns of it,

$$\text{Col}(A, j_1) = (a_{(1,j_1)}, a_{(2,j_1)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)})^T, \quad \text{Col}(A, j_2) = (a_{(1,j_2)}, a_{(2,j_2)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_2)})^T.$$

Then, by known, we have

$$(a_{(1,j_1)}a_{(1,j_2)}, a_{(2,j_1)}a_{(2,j_2)}, \dots, a_{(n,j_1)}a_{(n,j_2)}) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0).$$

That is, at least there is one positive integer s ($1 \leq s \leq n$) such that $a_{(s,j_1)} \neq 0, a_{(s,j_2)} \neq 0$.

Let $\beta_1 = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ be any set of nonnegative real numbers that are not totally equal. And suppose that the subscripts that $\min(\beta_1)$ appears on β_1 are $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k$ ($1 \leq k \leq n$), and the subscripts that $\max(\beta_1)$ appears on β_1 are $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t$ ($1 \leq t \leq n$).

Consider the product of β_1 and the column j_1, j_2 of A , and note

$$\beta_{2j_1} = b_1 a_{(1,j_1)} + b_2 a_{(2,j_1)} + \dots + b_n a_{(n,j_1)},$$

$$\beta_{2j_2} = b_1 a_{(1,j_2)} + b_2 a_{(2,j_2)} + \cdots + b_n a_{(n,j_2)}.$$

Suppose that $\beta_{2j_1} = \min(\beta_1)$, $\beta_{2j_2} = \max(\beta_1)$, then by 2°, 3° of Lemma 2.1 we have

$$a_{(s_1,j_1)} + a_{(s_2,j_1)} + \cdots + a_{(s_k,j_1)} = 1,$$

$$a_{(r_1,j_2)} + a_{(r_2,j_2)} + \cdots + a_{(r_t,j_2)} = 1.$$

On the one hand, the matrix A is column stochastic, so the nonzero numbers of the column j_1 of A only appear in $(a_{(s_1,j_1)}, a_{(s_2,j_1)}, \cdots, a_{(s_k,j_1)})$. Similarly, the nonzero numbers of the column j_2 only appear in $(a_{(r_1,j_2)}, a_{(r_2,j_2)}, \cdots, a_{(r_t,j_2)})$. But there is at least one positive integer s ($1 \leq s \leq n$) such that $a_{(s,j_1)} \neq 0, a_{(s,j_2)} \neq 0$. Thus there is at least one common element both in $(s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_k)$ and $(r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_t)$.

On the other hand, because $\min(\beta_1) \neq \max(\beta_1)$, then elements in $(s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_k, r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_t)$ are distinct. So, there is a contradiction.

The reason for the above contradiction is that we mistakenly suppose that both $\min(\beta_1)$ and $\max(\beta_1)$ are in $\beta_1 A$. So $\min(\beta_1)$ and $\max(\beta_1)$ can't be in $\beta_1 A$ at one time. And by 1° of Lemma 2.1, thus sufficiency holds.

For the contracting intervals, whether the length of a interval will converge to 0 is very important. So, for a fixed matrix A , we should consider the maximal value of function

$$M_A(X) = \frac{\max(XA) - \min(XA)}{\max(X) - \min(X)}, \quad (3)$$

where $X = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$, $x_i \geq 0$ and $\max(X) - \min(X) \neq 0$.

Lemma 2.3. Given a fixed column stochastic mean matrix A . The maximal value of function $M_A(X)$ exists under the condition $[x_i \geq 0, \max(X) - \min(X) \neq 0]$, and it is less than 1.

Proof. Firstly, suppose that $\min(X) = 0$ (otherwise use $\tilde{X} = (x_1 - \min(X), x_2 - \min(X), \cdots, x_n - \min(X))$ instead of X). It is easily to prove that $M_A(\tilde{X}) = M_A(X)$.

Secondly, suppose that $\max(X) = 1$ (otherwise use $\tilde{X} = (x_1/\max(X), x_2/\max(X), \cdots, x_n/\max(X))$ instead of X). Similarly, we can prove that $M_A(\tilde{X}) = M_A(X)$.

Thus we only consider the simplified function

$$M_A(X) = \max(XA) - \min(XA),$$

where $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ and $\max(X) = 1, \min(X) = 0$.

Repeatedly use the formulas

$$\max(x, y) = ((x + y) + |x - y|)/2,$$

$$\min(x, y) = ((x + y) - |x - y|)/2.$$

It is easily to find that $M_A(X)$ is continuous on the bounded closed region $[0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \max(X) = 1, \min(X) = 0]$, so the maximal value of it exists and less than 1.

Let $M_A = \max(M_A(X))$, and we call M_A the contraction coefficient of the column stochastic mean matrix A . For a concrete matrix A , M_A is easy to solve.

Example 1. Given

$$Q_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

find the contraction coefficient M_{Q_3} of Q_3 .

Solution. Suppose that $X = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, there are six different possible forms after the simplification of X , that is,

$$(0, x_2, 1), (1, x_2, 0), (x_1, 0, 1), (x_1, 1, 0), (0, 1, x_3), (1, 0, x_3).$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{Q_3}(0, x_2, 1) &= \max((0, x_2, 1)T_3) - \min((0, x_2, 1)T_3) \\ &= \max((x_2 + 1)/3, (x_2 + 1)/2, 1) - \min((x_2 + 1)/3, (x_2 + 1)/2, 1) \\ &= 1 - (x_2 + 1)/3 \leq 2/3 (\text{holds when } x_2 = 0). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, it still holds for the other forms. So $M_{Q_3} = 2/3$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is a set of nonnegative real numbers that are not totally equal, and A is a $n \times n$ column stochastic mean matrix. Note that the length of interval $[a, b]$ is $d([a, b])$, then

$$d([\min(XA), \max(XA)]) \leq M_A d([\min(X), \max(X)]).$$

The purpose of the contraction coefficient M_A is to denote the above relation.

2.2. Proof for the Main Lemma

Main Lemma is not only very important for the proof of the main results but also very valuable itself.

Main Lemma. Let Ω be a set that is consisted of finite $n \times n$ column stochastic mean matrices. Then Choose countable infinite matrices from Ω at random (repeats allowed), and the product of these infinite matrices will converge to a column stochastic mean matrix with rank 1.

Proof. For Ω is a finite set, then there is a matrix whose contraction coefficient is maximal in it. Denote the maximal contraction coefficient with M_Ω .

Let the column stochastic mean matrices picked in turn from Ω are

$$B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m, \dots$$

And let $B_1 = [a_{(i,j)}]$, take the first row of B_1 as the sequence of vectors $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 &= (a_{(1,1)}, a_{(1,2)}, \dots, a_{(1,n)}), \\ \beta_2 &= (a_{(1,1)}, a_{(1,2)}, \dots, a_{(1,n)})B_2, \\ &\dots, \dots, \\ \beta_m &= (a_{(1,1)}, a_{(1,2)}, \dots, a_{(1,n)})B_2B_3 \cdots B_m, \\ &\dots, \dots. \end{aligned}$$

If there is a positive integer k such that $\min(\beta_k) = \max(\beta_k)$, then by column stochastic, it is clearly that the sequence $\{\beta_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $(b_1, b_1, \dots, b_1)$, $b_1 = \min(\beta_k)$. Otherwise, by Definition 2.1, there is a nested closed set such that

$$[\min(\beta_1), \max(\beta_1)] \supset [\min(\beta_2), \max(\beta_2)] \supset \dots \supset [\min(\beta_m), \max(\beta_m)] \supset \dots$$

And by Lemma 2.4, the length of the m^{th} interval is less than $d([\min(\beta_1), \max(\beta_1)])M_{\Omega}^{m-1}$. Thus, when $m \rightarrow \infty$, the length of the interval converges to 0.

According to rule of intermediate sequence, the sequence of vectors $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots$ converges to $(b_1, b_1, \dots, b_1)$, where

$$b_1 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \min(\beta_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \max(\beta_m).$$

Analogously, pick the prime vector β_1 as the i^{th} row of the matrix B_1 , then we have the corresponding limit vector which is denoted as $(b_i, b_i, \dots, b_i)$. Thus

$$\prod_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & b_1 & \dots & b_1 \\ b_2 & b_2 & \dots & b_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_n & b_n & \dots & b_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then there are two corollaries about random column stochastic mean matrices.

Corollary 2.5. For a random column stochastic mean matrix A , the sequence $\{A^m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges to a matrix with rank 1.

Corollary 2.6. Given a column stochastic mean matrix A . If there is a positive integer k such that A^k is a column stochastic mean matrix, then the sequence $\{A^m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges to a matrix with rank 1.

Corollary 2.6 is very valuable, for there are so many column stochastic matrices are not column stochastic mean, but there exists some positive integer k such that A^k is a column stochastic mean matrix. The matrix Q_1 in (2) is just like this, and Q_1^2 is a column stochastic mean matrix.

In the next section, we will present some preliminary notions of difference substitution. Thus, all of the section 2 and 3 built a solid foundation for the section 4.

3. Preliminary Notions of Difference Substitution

$n \times n$ upper triangular matrix T_n and T_n^{-1} are respectively

$$T_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \dots & \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{1}{n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T_n^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & -(n-1) \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]$ be a permutation of $1, 2, \dots, n$. $P_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} = [a_{(i,j)}]$ is a $n \times n$ matrix for which

$$a_{(1,k_1)} = 1, a_{(2,k_2)} = 1, \dots, a_{(n,k_n)} = 1,$$

and 0 in all other positions (Permutation matrix).

Definition 3.1. $n \times n$ square matrix $B_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]}$ is defined as follows:

$$B_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} = P_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} T_n.$$

And the set that consists of all $B_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]}$ is denoted by PT_n (there are $n!$ elements in PT_n).

The standard simplex on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$ is defined as follows,

$$\Delta_n = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T | x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, \dots, x_n \geq 0, x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n = 1\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. Given $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$. If $X \in \Delta_n$, then $B_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} X \in \Delta_n$.

Proof. The proof is very straightforward and is omitted.

Definition 3.2. Let $[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]$ be a permutation of $1, 2, \dots, n$, and let $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$. Then we set a linear mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} : \Delta_n &\rightarrow \Delta_n, \\ X &\mapsto B_{[k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n]} X, \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, composition of mapping $\psi_{[a]}$ is respectively

$$\psi_{[a_1]} \psi_{[a_2]} \cdots \psi_{[a_m]}(X) = \psi_{[a_1]}(\psi_{[a_2]} \cdots (\psi_{[a_m]}(X)) \cdots) = B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]} X,$$

for which $'[x]'$ denotes a permutation of $1, 2, \dots, n$. Thus, we briefly note

$$\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_m]} = \psi_{[a_1]} \psi_{[a_2]} \cdots \psi_{[a_m]}. \quad (4)$$

The image set of $\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_m]}$ is denoted by $\text{Im}(\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_m]})$. Let $P_1, \dots, P_n$ be points of Δ_n that are affinely independent. The simplex with vertices $P_1, \dots, P_n$ is denoted by $[P_1, \dots, P_n]$. Then $\Delta_n = [e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n]$, where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T, \dots, e_n = (0, 0, \dots, 1)^T$.

Obviously, $\text{Im}(\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_m]})$ is the simplex $[e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n] B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}$. Thus, we briefly note

$$\text{Im}(\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_m]}) = [e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n] B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]} = \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}.$$

We use $d(S)$ for representing the diameter of simplex S , then we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.2. Let $P_1, \dots, P_n$ be points of Δ_n that are affinely independent. The simplex with vertices $P_1, \dots, P_n$ is denoted by $[P_1, \dots, P_n]$. Then there are

1°

$$[P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n] = \bigcup_{[a]}^{n!} [P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n] B_{[a]},$$

where the mark $\bigcup_{[a]}^{n!}$ denotes the union of the $n!$ permutations that $[a]$ traverses.

2°

$$\frac{d([P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n])}{d([P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n]B_{[a]})} \leq \frac{n-1}{n}.$$

Proof. (Sketch) 1° Consider the simplex $[P_1, \dots, P_n]B_{[1,2,\dots,n]}$, namely,

$$[P_1, \frac{P_1 + P_2}{2}, \dots, \frac{P_1 + P_2 + \dots + P_n}{n}].$$

Note that $\frac{P_1 + P_2 + \dots + P_i}{i}$ is the barycenter of simplex $[P_1, P_2, \dots, P_i]$, then $\bigcup_{[a]}^{n!} [P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n]B_{[a]}$ is exactly the barycentric subdivision of $[P_1, \dots, P_n]$.

The result of 2° is a elementary property of barycentric subdivision (Armstrong, M. A. (1983); Basu, S., Pollack, R., Roy, M. F. (2006)).

By Lemma 3.2, we immediately have

Lemma 3.3.

1°

$$\Delta_n = \bigcup_{[a_m]}^{n!} \dots \bigcup_{[a_2]}^{n!} \bigcup_{[a_1]}^{n!} (\Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]}).$$

2°

$$\frac{d(\Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]})}{d(\Delta_n)} < (\frac{n-1}{n})^m.$$

Definition 3.3. When $[a_1], [a_2], \dots, [a_m]$ traverse all the permutations of $1, 2, \dots, n$ respectively, we define the set

$$\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f) = \bigcup_{[a_m]}^{n!} \bigcup_{[a_2]}^{n!} \dots \bigcup_{[a_1]}^{n!} f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]} X),$$

which is called the set of difference substitution with degree m of the form f .

Generally, $\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)$ is constructed from $(n!)^m$ polynomials.

Now it's time to define the sequence of SDS sets.

Definition 3.4. Given the form $f \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$, we define the sequence of sets $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as follows

$$\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^\infty = \text{SDS}(f), \text{SDS}^{(2)}(f), \dots \quad (5)$$

We will define the termination of this sequence, which is directly related to the positive semi-definite property of form f .

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \in N^n$, and let $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n$. Then we write a form f with degree d as

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} C_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}, \quad C_\alpha \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (6)$$

Then there are some definitions on termination of $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$.

Definition 3.5. The form f is called trivially positive if the coefficients C_{α} of every terms $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ in f are nonnegative. If $f(1, 1, \dots, 1) < 0$, then f is trivially negative.

Lemma 3.5. 1° If the form f is trivially positive, then $f \in \text{PSD}$.
2° If the form f is trivially negative, then $f \notin \text{PSD}$.

Definition 3.6. Given a form f , if there is a positive integer k such that every element of the set $\text{SDS}^{(k)}(f)$ is trivially positive, the sequence of sets $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is called positively terminating.

Definition 3.7. Given a form f , if there is a positive integer k and a form g such that $g \in \text{SDS}^{(k)}(f)$ and g is trivially negative, the sequence of sets $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is called negatively terminating.

Definition 3.8. Given a form f , the sequence of sets $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is neither positively terminating nor negatively terminating, then it is called not terminating.

Next, let us record some properties of relations between termination of $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ and PSD.

Lemma 3.6. Given the form $f \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$, and an arbitrary natural number m , then the following equivalence relations hold.

1° $f \in \text{PSD} \iff \text{SDS}^{(m)}(f) \subset \text{PSD}$.
2° $f \notin \text{PSD} \iff \exists g \in \text{SDS}^{(m)}(f), g \notin \text{PSD}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
1^\circ \quad f \in \text{PSD} &\iff f(X) \geq 0, \forall X \in \Delta_n \\
&\iff f(X) \geq 0, \forall X \in \bigcup_{[a_m]}^{n!} \bigcup_{[a_2]}^{n!} \cdots \bigcup_{[a_1]}^{n!} (\Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}) \\
&\iff f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]} X) \geq 0, \forall X \in \Delta_n, \forall B_{[a_i]} \in \text{PT}_n \\
&\iff g \in \text{PSD}, \forall g \in \text{SDS}^{(m)}(f) \\
&\iff \text{SDS}^{(m)}(f) \subset \text{PSD}.
\end{aligned}$$

2° getting by 1°.

4. Proof of the Main Results

It's time to prove main results.

Theorem 1. Let $f \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ be a form, then there are

1° $f \in \text{PSD}$ iff the sequence of SDS sets of f is positively terminating or not terminating.

2° $f \notin \text{PSD}$ iff the sequence of SDS sets of f is negatively terminating.

3° If f is positive definite on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$, then its sequence of SDS is positively terminating.

Next we will show the proof of Theorem step by step. First prove 1° and 2°.

4.1. Proof of 1° and 2° in Theorem 1

Proof. By the definitions of the termination of sequence of sets (definition 3.6, 3.7, 3.8) we know that 1° is equivalent to 2°. So we just need to prove 2°.

The proof of sufficiency is straightforward by the conclusion of 2° in Lemma 3.6. So to prove necessity, we will discuss the problem on the standard simplex Δ_n for f is homogeneous.

Suppose that the form $f \notin \text{PSD}$. Then by the definition 1.1, $\exists X_0 \in \Delta_n$ such that $f(X_0) < 0$. And we suppose that X_0 is interior to Δ_n for such point is obviously existing.

Since polynomials are continuous on Δ_n , there exists a sufficient small spherical neighborhood $O(X_0, \epsilon)$ of X_0 satisfying

$$\forall X \in O(X_0, \epsilon), f(X) < 0.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we can choose the simplex that include the point X_0 one by one:

$$\Delta_n B_{[a_1]}, \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]}, \dots, \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]}, \dots$$

Then we obtain a sequence of nested closed sets

$$\Delta_n B_{[a_1]} \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \supset \dots \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]} \supset \dots$$

By 2° of Lemma 3.3, the diameters of these bounded closed sets are monotonically decreasing and tending to 0. According as the theorem of nested closed set, X_0 is the only common point of the above sequence of closed sets. That is, when $m \rightarrow +\infty$, there exists a natural number L such that

$$O(X_0, \epsilon) \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_L]} \supset \dots$$

Thus

$$\forall X \in \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_L]}, f(X) < 0.$$

Let $g = f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_L]} X)$, and $Y_0 = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$. Then we have

$$g(Y_0) = f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_L]} Y_0) < 0.$$

That is the form $f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_L]} X)$ is trivially negative. Then $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is negatively terminating.

The proof for 1° and 2° in Theorem 1 is completed. Now we'll show the proof of 3°.

4.2. Proof of 3° in Theorem 1

First we'll give several Lemmas for the proof of 3°.

Lemma 4.1 Given a form of degree d

$$g = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} C_{\alpha} x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

If there is $g(X) = 0$ at each point X of the standard simplex Δ_n , then g is a 0 polynomial. That is, for all of the α , we have $C_{\alpha} = 0$.

Lemma 4.1 is a well known conclusion (see Cox, D., Little, J., O'Shea, D. (1996)), which can be proved by induction.

Lemma 4.2. Given a form of degree d

$$f_m = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} C_{(\alpha,m)} x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

If the sequence $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ uniformly converges to 0 on the standard simplex Δ_n , then the corresponding sequence of coefficients $\{C_{(\alpha,m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ will converge to 0.

Proof. We only give the proof for the binary form with degree d , and the multivariate form can be gotten by induction.

Let

$$f_m = C_{(d,0,m)} x_1^d + C_{(0,d,m)} x_2^d + x_1 x_2 (C_{(d-1,1,m)} x_1^{d-2} + \cdots + C_{(1,d-1,m)} x_2^{d-2}).$$

Then pick $(x_1, x_2) = (1, 0), (0, 1)$ and we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C_{(d,0,m)} = 0, \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C_{(0,d,m)} = 0$. Consider the new polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} f_m^{(1)} &= f_m - (C_{(d,0,m)} x_1^d + C_{(0,d,m)} x_2^d) \\ &= x_1 x_2 (C_{(d-1,1,m)} x_1^{d-2} + \cdots + C_{(1,d-1,m)} x_2^{d-2}). \end{aligned}$$

It is obviously that $f_m^{(1)}$ still uniformly converges to 0 on the standard simplex Δ_2 , that is, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, when m is sufficient large,

$$|x_1 x_2 (C_{(d-1,1,m)} x_1^{d-2} + \cdots + C_{(1,d-1,m)} x_2^{d-2})| < \varepsilon$$

holds.

Let $x_1 = (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}), x_2 = \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, substituting them in the above inequality, we have

$$|(1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})(C_{(d-1,1,m)}(1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})^{d-2} + \cdots + C_{(1,d-1,m)}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{d-2})| < \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

And let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, then we have $C_{(d-1,1,m)} \rightarrow 0$. Analogously, let $x_1 = \sqrt{\varepsilon}, x_2 = (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})$, then we have $C_{(1,d-1,m)} \rightarrow 0$.

Do repeated discussion, and finally we have that every sequence $\{C_{(\alpha,m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ converges to 0.

Lemma 4.3. Given two forms of degree d

$$\begin{aligned} f_m &= \sum_{|\alpha|=d} C_{(\alpha,m)} x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}, \\ g &= \sum_{|\alpha|=d} C_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}. \end{aligned}$$

If the sequence $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ uniformly converges to g on the standard simplex Δ_n , then the corresponding sequence of coefficients $\{C_{(\alpha,m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ will converge to C_α .

Proof of 3° in Theorem 1. We choose countable infinite matrices from PT_n at random:

$$B_{[a_1]}, B_{[a_2]}, \cdots, B_{[a_m]}, \cdots.$$

Since PT_n is a finite set that consists of column stochastic mean matrices, by Main

Lemma, $\prod_{m=1}^{\infty} B_{[a_m]}$ is convergent, and let

$$B = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} B_{[a_m]} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & b_1 & \cdots & b_1 \\ b_2 & b_2 & \cdots & b_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_n & b_n & \cdots & b_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we denote the degree of form f as d , $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$, then there always be $f(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) > 0$ for f is positive definite on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$. Thus by the homogeneous of f , we know that

$$f\left(\prod_{m=1}^{\infty} B_{[a_m]} X\right) = f(BX) = f(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n)^d. \quad (7)$$

is trivially positive.

Consider the infinite sequence of polynomials

$$f(X), f(B_{[a_1]}X), f(B_{[a_1]}B_{[a_2]}X), \dots, f(B_{[a_1]}B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}X), \dots \quad (8)$$

Next we will prove that there exists a positive integer m_0 , for $m > m_0$ such that $f(B_{[a_1]}B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}X)$ is trivially positive.

On the one hand, for f is continuous on Δ_n , namely, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a spherical neighborhood $O(P, \delta) \subset \Delta_n$ of $P = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ (If P is on the boundary of Δ_n , then we take $O(P, \delta) \cap \Delta_n$) satisfying $\forall X_1, X_2 \in O(P, \delta), |f(X_1) - f(X_2)| < \varepsilon$.

On the other hand, by 2° of Lemma 3.3, we know that the diameters of following nested closed sets are monotonically decreasing and tending to 0,

$$\Delta_n \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \supset \cdots \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]} \supset \cdots$$

According as the theorem of nested closed set, these sets have only a common point. Obviously it is $P = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$.

Putting together the above two aspects, we have that when $m \rightarrow +\infty$, there exists a natural number L such that

$$O(P, \delta) \supset \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_L]} \supset \cdots$$

That is, when $m_1, m_2 > L$, $\forall X_1 \in \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_{m_1}]} (= \text{Im}(\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_{m_1}]})$, $\forall X_2 \in \Delta_n B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_{m_2}]} (= \text{Im}(\psi_{[a_1][a_2] \cdots [a_{m_2}]})$ there is

$$|f(X_1) - f(X_2)| < \varepsilon,$$

namely, $\forall X \in \Delta_n$ there is

$$|f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_{m_1}]} X) - f(B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_{m_2}]} X)| < \varepsilon$$

So the sequence of polynomials (8) uniformly converges to $f(BX)$ on Δ_n . By Lemma 4.3, the sequence of coefficients of the same monomials in the sequence (8) will converge to the coefficients of the same monomial of $f(BX)$. And the coefficients of $f(BX)$

are all positive (see (7)), so there exists a positive integer m_0 , for $m > m_0$ such that $f(B_{[a_1]}B_{[a_2]} \cdots B_{[a_m]}X)$ is trivially positive.

For the infinite sequence (8) is arbitrary, the sequence of sets $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is positively terminating.

4.3. Corollary, algorithm and other consideration

It's well-known to us that if the binary form f is a positive semi-definite form with no square factors, then f is definitely a positive definite form.

Corollary 4.4 The binary form f has no square factors, then f is positive semi-definite iff the sequence of sets of f is positively terminating. And f is not a semi-definite form iff the sequence of sets of f is negatively terminating.

Thus we obtain the following algorithm by the theorem 1, which is used to decide the positive semi-definite form.

Algorithm(NEWTSDS)

Input: form $f \in \mathcal{Q}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$.

Output: the form $f \in \text{PSD}$, or $f \notin \text{PSD}$.

T1: Let $F = \{f\}$.

T2: For each element in F Compute $\bigcup_{g \in F} \text{SDS}(g)$.

Let $Temp = \bigcup_{g \in F} \text{SDS}(g) - \{\text{trivially positive polynomials in } \bigcup_{g \in F} \text{SDS}(g)\}$.

T21: If $Temp$ is null, then output $f \in \text{PSD}$ and terminate.

T22: If there are trivially negative polynomials in $Temp$, then output $f \notin \text{PSD}$ and terminate.

T23: Else, let $F = Temp$, go to step T2.

According to the above algorithm, we designed a Maple program called TSDS3. It mainly has two orders, TSDS and NEWTSDS. TSDS chooses A_n as basic substitution matrix, and NEWTSDS chooses T_n as basic substitution matrix.

To the order TSDS, there are some PD forms making the program do not terminate. For example,

$$f = (3x_1 + x_2 - x_3)^2 + \frac{x_3^2}{3}.$$

And to the order NEWTSDS, by Theorem 1, we confirm that the program will terminate if the input form f itself is not PSD, and judge that $f \geq 0$ does not hold. Otherwise, if the input form f itself is PSD, then the program either terminate(that is, judge that $f \geq 0$ holds) or does not(namely, can't decide whether $f \geq 0$ holds). However, as the 3° in Theorem 1 says, the algorithm NEWTSDS is complete for the positive definite form. And if we enter the subprogram of eliminating square factors, then the algorithm NEWTSDS is also complete for the decision of binary form.

Then it follows a question naturally: What is the necessary and sufficient condition to determine that a $\{\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is not terminating for a general form f ?

We can generalize the Theorem 1 as follows

Let $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k$ be $n \times n$ column stochastic mean matrices, such that

$$[P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n] = \bigcup_{i=1}^k [P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n] R_i,$$

where $[P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n]$ is arbitrarily a simplex in Δ_n . And the set $\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f)$ is defined as

$$\text{SDS}^{(m)}(f) = \bigcup_{i_1=1}^k \dots \bigcup_{i_m=1}^k f(R_{i_1} \dots R_{i_m} X).$$

Then the results of Theorem 1 still hold.

In addition, from the aspect of the method of partial cylindrical algebraic decomposition (PCAD) (Collins, G. E., Hong, H. , 1991), it is easily to prove that:

Lemma 4.5. Given the form $f \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$. There exists a positive integer m such that the point set

$$K_m = \bigcup_{[a_m]}^{n!} \dots \bigcup_{[a_2]}^{n!} \bigcup_{[a_1]}^{n!} B_{[a_1]} B_{[a_2]} \dots B_{[a_m]} \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\right)^T.$$

has at least one sample point in each cell (here all the lower dimensional cells are discarded).

Lemma 4.5 gives another way for the completion of the algorithm NEWTSDS. That is, to compute the upper bound of m , which is a fine subject for further study.

5. Comparison between Theorem 1 and Pòlya's Theorem and Applying examples

Theorem (Pòlya's) If a form $f \in \mathcal{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ is positive on $\mathcal{R}_+^n$ when $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n > 0$, then for sufficiently large N all the coefficients of

$$(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n)^N f$$

are positive.

Pòlya's Theorem appeared in 1928 (in German) and is also in «Inequalities» by Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E., and Pòlya, G. (1952). From then on, this elegant and beautiful result has many applications. In 1946, Habicht (1940) skillfully used Pòlya's Theorem to give a constructive proof of a positive definite case of Hilbert's 17th Problem. And recently, Schweighofer, M. (2002, 2004) used Pòlya's Theorem to give an algorithm proof of Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz. Furthermore, the quantitative form of Pòlya's Theorem has been used in the study of some other problems (de Klerk, E., Pasechnik, D. , 2002), and the study of quantitative problems themselves obtains very good results (Powers, V., Reznick, B. , 2001, 2006). We hope sincerely that the results in this paper will do some similarly contributions on the above fields.

Next we will show the comparison between Theorem 1 and Pòlya's Theorem in several following aspects:

Table 1

The given classes	Pòlya's Theorem	Theorem 1
PD	Completely decide	Completely decide
PSD with boundary zero	Partially apply	Partially apply
PSD with interior zero	Can't decide	Partially apply
not PSD	Can't decide	Completely decide

From the above table, we know that Pólya's Theorem holds at item 1, but fail at item 3 and 4, while Theorem 1 in this paper is complete at item 1 and 4, and partial applicable at item 2 and 3. Next we will give some practical examples to show this difference.

Example 2.(PD, A-G) Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_3) \in \mathcal{R}_+^n$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Consider the positive definite form

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^n - (n - \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

In the book of Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E., and Pòlya, G. (1952), this example is analyzed by Pòlya's method, where when N equals $\frac{n^3(n-1)}{2\varepsilon}$, we have a trivially positive polynomial.

Analogously, the Hurwitz identity relation is recorded in the same book,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^n - n \prod_{i=1}^n x_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2n!} \left(\sum! (x_1^{n-1} - x_2^{n-1})(x_1 - x_2) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum! (x_1^{n-2} - x_2^{n-2})(x_1 - x_2)x_3 \\ &\quad \left. + \sum! (x_1^{n-3} - x_2^{n-3})(x_1 - x_2)x_3x_4 + \dots \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the notion $\sum!$ denotes the sum of all permutations of the variables. From the Hurwitz identity relation we easily get that the elements of the set $\text{SDS}(f_1)$ is trivially positive(the basic substitution matrix can be any one of A_n and T_n).

Example 3.(PSD, Schur) (Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E., and Pòlya, G. (1952), Mitrovic, D. S., Vaic, P. M. (1970)) Let x, y, z are nonnegative numbers and t is a real number, and let $x \neq 0$ of x^0 as usual. Then

$$g = x^t(x - y)(x - z) + y^t(y - x)(y - z) + z^t(z - x)(z - y) \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

with equality if and only if $x = y = z$ or all permutations of $x = 0, y = z$.

For g has interior zero $(1, 1, 1)$, then it is not suitable for Pòlya's Theorem. And we'll give the analysis of Theorem 1. Using the basic substitution matrix A_3 (or T_3), we compute $\text{SDS}(g)$. By symmetry, we only compute $g(A_3X)$, $X = (x, y, z)^T$.

$$g(A_3X) = (x + y + z)^t x^2 + ((x + y + z)^t - (y + z)^t + z^t)yx + z^t y^2.$$

Note that $(x + y + z)^t - (y + z)^t + z^t \geq 0$ obviously holds, so inequality (9) holds, with equality if and only if

$$\begin{cases} ((x + y + z)^t - (y + z)^t + z^t)yx = 0 \\ z^t y^2 = 0 \\ (x + y + z)^t x^2 = 0 \end{cases}$$

Solve that $y = 0, x = 0$, and z is arbitrary, or $x = 0, z = 0$, and y is arbitrary. And then return to original variables by multiplying A_3^{-1} , thus we get the condition of equality. That is, $x = y = z$ or all permutations of $z = 0, y = x$.

Example 4 (not PSD, Vasc conjecture) (Yang, L., Xia, B. C. , 2008) Try to decide whether the inequality holds.

$$\frac{a_1 - a_2}{a_2 + a_3} + \frac{a_2 - a_3}{a_3 + a_4} + \frac{a_3 - a_4}{a_4 + a_5} + \frac{a_4 - a_5}{a_5 + a_6} + \frac{a_5 - a_6}{a_6 + a_1} + \frac{a_6 - a_1}{a_1 + a_2} \geq 0,$$

in which $a_i > 0 (i = 1, \dots, 6)$.

Take off denominators of the left polynomial, and then denote the new polynomial by f . Utilizing the program TSDS and executing order $tsds(f)$, we have a counterexample: $a_1 = 84, a_2 = 7, a_3 = 79, a_4 = 5, a_5 = 76, a_6 = 1$. Analogously, it is easy to prove that the inequalities like above in 3,4,5,7 variables(in case of 7 needs longer time) still holds.

There are more examples in (Yang , 2005, 2006, July 15-22, 2006; Yang, L., Xia, B. C. , 2008) and on the web <http://www.irgoc.org/bbs /dispbbs.asp? boardid=12 &id=3105 &page= &star=10>, we do not list them one by one.

References

- Yang, L., 2005. Solving Harder Problems with Lesser Mathematics. Proceedings of the 10th Asian Technology Conference in Mathematics, ATCM Inc, 37-46
- Yang, L., 2006. Difference substitution and automated inequality proving. Journal of Guangzhou University: Natural Science Edition. 5(2), 1-7 (in Chinese)
- Yang, L., 2006 (July 15-22). Some new advances of automated inequality proving. Summer School on Symbolic Computation. Beijing, China
- Yang, L., Xia, B. C., 2008. Automated Proving and Discovering on Inequalities. Science Press, Beijing. (in Chinese)
- Horn, R. A., Johnson, C. R., 1999. Matrix Analysis. Camb. Univ. Press. 525-527
- Cox, D., Little, J., O'Shea, D, 1996. Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms. New York. Springer-Verlag, 3-4
- Collins, G. E., Hong, H., 1991. Partial cylindrical algebraic decomposition for quantifier elimination, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 12: 299-328
- Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E., Pòlya, G., 1952. Inequalities. 2nd ed. Camb. Univ. Press
- Habicht, W., 1940. Über die Zerlegung strikte definiter Formen in Quadrate. comment Math. Helv. 12, 317-322
- Schweighofer, M., 2002. An algorithmic approach to Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz. J. Pure and Appl. Alg. 166, 307-319
- Schweighofer, M., 2004. On the complexity of Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz . J. Complexity. 20, 529-543

- de Klerk, E., Pasechnik, D., 2002. Approximation of the stability number of a graph via copositive programming. *SIAM J. Optimization*. 12, 875-892
- Powers, V., Reznick, B., 2001. A new bound for Polyá's Theorem with applications to polynomials positive on polyhedra. *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* 164, 221-229
- Powers, V., Reznick, B., 2006. A quantitative Polyá's Theorem with corner zeros. In: *Proc. ISSAC'06*. ACM Press
- Mitrinovic, D. S., Vajc, P. M., 1970. *Analytic Inequalities*. New York (Berlin, Heidelberg). Springer-Verlag
- Armstrong, M. A., 1983. *Basic Topology*. New York (Berlin, Heidelberg). Springer-Verlag. 125-127
- Basu, S., Pollack, R., Roy, M. F. 2006. *Algorithms in Real Algebraic Geometry* (2nd). New York (Berlin, Heidelberg). Springer-Verlag. 215-217